PASMORE

Karl Gutzkow and his Relation to Socialism

German

A. M.

1914

UNIV. OF
ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
1914
P27

KARL GUTZKOW AND HIS RELATION TO SOCIALISM

BY

DANIEL FREDERICK PASMORE

A. B. Albion College, 1913

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

IN GERMAN

IN

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1914

1914
P27

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

June 5th 1914

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Daniel Frederick Pasmore

ENTITLED Karl Gutzkow and his relation to socialism

BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF Master of Arts in German

O. E. Lessing.
In Charge of Major Work

Julius Goebel
Head of Department

Recommendation concurred in:

Committee on Final Examination

284622

UIUC

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

♀ ♀ ♀ ♀

I	Historical Background	Page 1
II	Heine and St. Simonism	9
III	Gutzkow and St. Simonism	23
IV	Die Ritter vom Geiste	40
V	Conclusion	52

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/karlgutzkowhisre00pasm

CHAPTER I.

***

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.

***

The literary life of a nation is to a large extent a reflex of the political, social, industrial, and economic conditions of the time. It is only as we keep in mind these various elements that we are properly fitted to judge of the value of the literary products of any period both for its own and for succeeding generations. Of no time perhaps is this truer than of the period in German literature that beginning about 1830 extended until the end of the third quarter of the century.

Politically Germany throughout the greater part of this period was overshadowed by several of the European powers, particularly by France, Russia, Austria and England. Her territory was divided among a considerable number of petty rulers who quarreled among themselves, but who were quite united in denying any large measure of political freedom to their subjects. Prussia, the largest and the most powerful of the German states, was ruled by a reactionary king, and until the fall of Metternich was most responsive to the wishes of that statesman, whose one idea was to prevent the spread of liberal ideas and to maintain the status quo in European affairs. The expected liberal legislation which was promised to the German people in return for their loyal support during the Napoleonic wars was not granted them. Instead in the territories over which the power of the Holy Alliance extended repressive measures of the severest kind prevailed. Established for the purpose of preventing further revolutions,

to maintain legitimate monarchs on their thrones, to curb the power of the French, and to prevent the spread of liberal tendencies in Europe, the only really beneficial result of the Holy Alliance was to maintain a condition of peace throughout Europe at a time when worn out by the expenditures and bloodshed of the Napoleonic wars all nations ardently desired peace in order to recuperate their strength and recover from their losses of life and treasure. At the same time while thus restoring peaceful conditions, in none of the countries under the control of the Holy Alliance were there any steps of permanent importance taken to carry out the pledges made during the wars of liberation. These promises were left wholly unfulfilled. Frederick William in Prussia looked unfavorably upon any independent or liberal movements among his subjects. Newspapers were suppressed, the Karlsbad Decrees were passed, liberals everywhere were persecuted, and reaction politically reigned. Prussia sank also in importance in foreign affairs. The foremost state in the wars of liberation now became dependent upon the courts of St. Petersburg and Vienna.* The policy of the government in regard to clerical affairs was also characterized by the same tendency toward reaction and force. All of these policies were in direct contradiction to the spirit of the age. Thus the ground was prepared for the seeds of bitter discontent.

Socially, industrially, and economically great changes were also taking place during this period. This was the epoch that witnessed largely the rise of the powerful bourgeois class, the introduction of the capitalist system, the beginnings of metropolitan life, and in general, all the

---

*Cf. *Heinrich Heines Sämmtliche Werke,* herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Ernst Elster, vol. I, INTRODUCTION, pp. 35 - 38.

features that go to make up our present complex life. Germany was transformed from a purely agricultural country into an industrial, manufacturing nation with all the problems that are contingent upon this change in the economic structure. And to the distress and discontent that are the invariable accompaniments of such changes was added the political disaffection and the popular clamor for increased freedom from a governmental control that was irksome in the extreme.*

Foreign influence was also very strong in Germany, especially the French influence. The great watchword of the French revolution, liberty, equality, fraternity, had not been without its effect upon the liberal minds in Germany. They had seen the French nation throw off the shackles of a hated despotism, and amid the excesses and revolutions in government that had followed, still steadily advance in the direction of its great ideals. This had filled them with an ardent desire to accomplish their own destiny, which, they felt, was progress under an enlightened, constitutional government deriving its powers from the people and responsible to them. Thus in spite of the repressive system under which Germany existed during the first half of the nineteenth century, in spite of the fact that a free political career was denied to the enterprising youth of the land, there was a vast amount of secret agitation, and the liberal propaganda, unable to express itself publicly, was spread throughout a considerable portion of the population by means similar to those employed so successfully by the Carbonari and other like movements. Many were the schemes proposed, some novel and fantastic, some sensible, practicable methods, for advancing the political reforms. The July revolution of 1830 in

---

*Friedrich Kummer, *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Die zweite Generation,* pp. 190-199.

France appeared to the liberals to present a justification of their political principles and Paris was the Mecca of their faith. The various socialistic schemes advanced by Baboeuf, St. Simon, and Fourier appealed to many, in part or in their entirety, as the solution of the social and political conditions of the times. The unprecedented changes resulting from the industrial revolution, the substitution of a new ruling class, the bourgeoisie, in the place of the old landed nobility, the remarkable progress in science and invention that was continually taking place, all tended toward increasing the discontent caused by an unwise and reactionary governmental policy, and gave rise to the various more or less fantastic schemes for social betterment and change that have been termed Utopian.

Characteristically then the age was one of transition in which progress was being made in all lines but governmental, and against the policy of the German states in this respect, a policy so completely out of harmony with the age, the waves of opposition were continually beating higher. The principle of nationality which has since proved to be so potent a force in European history during the nineteenth century, and which was finally to accomplish in 1870 the formation of the German Empire was also even then stirring powerfully, and although repressed and obstructed, was continually gaining new strength from this very opposition for its coming victory.

Such then is the background of the period during which the forces were active that determined to a large extent the general character of the literature from about 1830 to 1860, and more particularly the period from 1830 to 1848, the period of the so-called Young German movement in literature. It was a time of general liberal tendencies, favored in most lines but repressed politically. It was the period which saw the birth of soc-

ialism and the inauguration of a variety of other forms of social reform. These new appearances in the political and social life naturally made their impress upon the literature. The writers of Young Germany devoted their best efforts to the production of works concerned largely with contemporary events, and as a result they influenced their own generation mightily. They were the pioneers of progress in Germany. Casting aside the hitherto prevailing romanticism with its exaltation of the middle ages, its quest for the "blaue Blume", and its mystical tendencies, they thrust themselves forward into what they considered a holy war for liberal ideas of every sort, and in so far as they were able to do so, hampered as they were by stringent press laws and a strict censorship, they fought bravely for their country's freedom from foreign dominance and for unity of government and liberalism at home.

But it is apparent that this battle of Young Germany for liberalism, freedom of the press, freedom from foreign dominance, and for a larger share in the government was really a battle for reform rather than a socialistic movement. Socialism, as we use the term today, to characterize the widespread, organized efforts of a body of people whose aim is to effect a complete change in the government and to usher in a socialistic state may be said not to have had an existence in Germany until the time of the Revolution of 1848.

In France and England active socialistic groups were carrying on aggressive campaigns for their various schemes prior to 1830. From the time of the French Revolution when Baboeuf had set forth his scheme for a state where absolute equality should prevail among the citizens and be enforced by the state, France had not been without one or more socialistic propagandas. St. Simon and Fourier had each his Utopia to offer to the

French. Blanc strongly urged the "right to labor," and the democratization of both government and industry. In England and America the influence and example of Owen, who was doing much to alleviate evils in industry and attempting to organize cooperating, self-supporting groups of laborers, was impressing itself strongly on the public mind.

But in Germany the case was different. Prior to the Revolution of 1848 only two Germans dared to be known as convinced and thorough going socialists. These were the revolutionist Wilhelm Weitling and the Berlin professor Victor Aimé Huber.* The former expounded doctrines that were thoroughly socialistic and made direct appeals to the working classes. He based many of his statements upon the social teachings of Christ and his apostles. He was greatly influenced also by the leaders of communism in France. Huber was like Weitling a man ahead of his time and was not understood. Both of these early agitators suffered persecution for their cause. Both were unappreciated.

Rodbertus, later considered to be one of the most important of early German socialists, published his book, "Our Economic Condition," in 1842, but the value of this work was not recognized at the time. During the same year Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels formed their intellectual partnership and in 1848 issued their "Communist Manifesto" from Brussels, which manifesto has since remained the classic exposition of modern evolutionary socialism. From this time on until Marx's death in 1863 the two carried on a relentless socialistic agitation.‡

But as has been said above, the agitation in Germany prior to 1848

---

*Theobald Ziegler, *Die geistigen und socialen Strömungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, p. 267-271.

‡Frederick A. Ogg, *Social Progress in Contemporary Europe*, CHAPTER XXII, p. 349.

was a fight for liberalism and reform of abuses in government rather than an organized socialistic movement. Even this had to be carried with great caution since the illiberal and reactionary government was continually on the watch for possible conspirators, and was suspicious of any but its devoted supporters. The literature of the time, newspapers, periodicals, books, pamphlets, all were carefully censored. New ideas were to be kept from finding expression in Germany if possible, and particularly was this true in Prussia.*

But in spite of this care, in a time seething with new ideas such as was the period of 1830 to 1848, new ideas would spread. The government could not prevent the operation of men's minds. It might imprison men, it could not imprison ideas.

Numbers of German artisans journeyed to Paris and there formed societies infected by communistic, socialistic, or revolutionary tendencies. In Switzerland there was formed the so-called "Young Europe", a secret society composed of German refugees and artisans organized under the influence of Mazzini, revolutionary in tendency and also infected with communistic and socialistic principles.‡

Finally in France Heinrich Heine, the great intermediary between French and German contemporary literature, was actively interested in the socialistic doctrines of the St. Simonian school, and set himself the task of presenting these doctrines to the German people. There is little question but that it was St. Simonism which exerted the greatest influence upon German literature of all the various socialistic propagandas previous

---

*C. D. Hazen, *Europe since 1815,* pp. 42-44.

‡Theobald Ziegler, *Die geistigen und socialen Strömungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts,* pp. 269-270.

to the era of scientific socialism inaugurated under Marx and Engels, and there is equally little doubt but that it was Heine whose presentation of St. Simonism most affected the German writers, and that it was from him that they drew most of their socialistic ideas.*

---

*J. Proelss, *Das Junge Deutschland,* p. 182.

CHAPTER II.

****

Heine and St. Simonism.

***

During the greater part of the nineteenth century Germany was not a strong, homogeneous nation. It was split up into a considerable number of states, each having its own special interests, its own local laws, and its own separate political life. As a result of this a strong feeling of national interest did not exist. On the other hand with the French, the English and various other nations, this sense of nationality was a very real thing. They were born with it, just as they were born with their language or with certain inherited tendencies. They found it complete and ready to hand. With the Germans this was not the case. With them the free political life was missing. However the desire for it was present. The yearning for a change was deep and widespread. Political freedom, religious freedom, the emancipation of women, the emancipation of the Jews, these were all questions that were raised and began to demand solution in the early part of the century. The feeling of helplessness and of inability to accomplish things worth while, the lack of opportunity for a career in the service of the state, these began to call for liberal government, for greater individual freedom of action, for unity at home, and for independence from foreign domination in the affairs of the German states. The great national movement of the nineteenth century that was destined ere it ended to lead to the formation of a united and powerful empire was already beginning in

Germany.*

The call to liberty, liberalism, and progress which had been voiced by many found a special group of advocates between the years 1830 and 1848 who were known by the name of Young Germany. The number of writers in the group was quite large, but the principal members were Heinrich Heine, Ludolph Wienbarg, Theodore Mundt, Karl Gutzkow, and Heinrich Laube. At the head of these writers and easily the most influential was Heinrich Heine. Beside him worked Ludwig Börne. These two overshadowed the others in influence and following and played an exceedingly important role as bearers of the French ideas to Germany and of German ideas to France.

Both of these men were Jews. Thus they were not bound so closely to the fatherland as were the remainder of the Young German writers. Moreover the position of the Jews was then by no means an enviable one in Germany. They were oppressed and looked down upon. In France conditions were different. There the Jews had equal rights and justice and considerable freedom. Hence those of them who had the means were glad to go to France. Thus it came about that Heine and Börne went over to Paris, while the rest of the Young Germans remained in the homeland enduring censorship, suppression of books, imprisonment, and a variety of forms of petty persecution.‡

Paris attracted these men for another reason as well. The July revolution of 1830 fastened the attention of the whole of Europe upon France and upon Paris in particular. There the people had arisen against a reactionary government, had overthrown Charles X, and had placed a new king of their own choice, Louis Philippe, upon the throne. The effect of this

---

*Cf. Wehl, *Das Junge Deutschland*, p. 14.

‡Wehl, loc. cit., pp. 77-78.

in Germany was electrical. The apathy and political indifference of the time vanished. The young German minds were shaken out of their dreamy, passive idealism and suddenly placed in an active sea of politics and governmental activity. They were roused to action and observation. Interest in French and English political life sprang up. The dreamy glow of the Middle Ages which had enveloped their minds was dispelled. Even the hatred of the French disappeared. Interest in French history, philosophy, literature, the drama, sprang up. The French paid considerable attention to the German art and science.*

Both peoples possessed similar ideas of political freedom. This was a bond making for friendship. A great wave of liberalism swept over the two countries. Under the influence of this both were willing to make great sacrifices at home for the advancement of liberal principles abroad. The Polish revolution received hearty sympathy. The common aim was the liberation of the oppressed peoples from their chains. Reform, progress, liberalism, were the watchwords of the thinkers of the time.

Literature was seized with the same spirit. The writings of the day ceased to be merely poetic effusions and pretty verses. Beneath the writings of nearly all the influential journalists and authors there could be readily recognized the note of discontent with existing conditions where reactionary and the desire for liberalism.

The center of this liberal movement was Paris. There the July revolution had resulted in a state of great intellectual and social confusion. Socialistic ideas of various sorts --- Fourier, St. Simon, Père Enfantin, Lamennais --- were rampant. The whole world, it seemed, was clouded in

---

*Compare Gutzkow, *Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, Die Neue Bildung,* for the influence of the French revolution of 1830 on Germany.

fog and mist. "Staub wirbelte auf, Lärm und Geschrei erscholl, ein Rauschen, Erbrausen, Poltern, Knarren, und Zersplittern war wahrnehmbar, als wäre ein neues Chaos hereingebrochen und die ganze Erde sollte umgeschaffen werden."* Under these circumstances it was but natural that Heine and Börne should be strongly attracted toward Paris.

Börne was a journalist who possessed his own peculiar, rapid, lively, sharp style and was accustomed, as the saying is, to hit the nail on the head nearly every time. To the younger writers, notably Gutzkow, he served as a model. He lived completely immersed in the politics of the day. His patriotism and intense liberalism were the consuming passions of his life. In the events of the year 1830, Börne saw his hopes realized and his views vindicated. His "Letters from Paris" reflect clearly the joy and gladness that he felt. As an agitator and a voicer of public sentiment Börne was necessary and served his generation well. Upon Gutzkow his influence was greater than that of Heine in many ways, and whereas a quarrel finally ended friendly relations between Gutzkow and Heine, no such unpleasant occurrence marred the relations of Börne and Gutzkow.

It was early in May 1831 when Heine went to Paris. The glorious city where the July revolution had occurred, the city of freedom, as it was looked upon by all the liberals, where he would be free from censors and gendarmes appealed powerfully to him. Here his desire for more movement, more life, and greater opportunities to accomplish results could be better gratified, he thought. Accordingly he threw himself enthusiastically upon the great highway of liberalism; into the thickest of the fight he plunged with the abandon that so often characterized his actions.

In Paris he found many things to interest and divert him. Especially

---

*Cf. Wehl, *Das Junge Deutschland*, p. 78.

did he find there a new social and philosophical system that offered a solution of the contradictions between his own romantic tendencies as a writer and his rationalistic democracy. This was the system of St. Simonism which was just then at its height. To this cult Heine immediately and passionately joined himself.

The founder of this school of socialism was Count Henri de Saint Simon. As a youth Saint Simon had served in the American Revolution under Washington. Returning to France, he abandoned a promising military carreer and devoted himself to the study of politics and social questions. He became wretchedly poor and his health was not good, nevertheless throughout a quarter of a century he labored to evolve a social order that might so commend itself as to win adoption. The hypothesis upon which he built was that the greatest happiness of mankind was yet to be realized. The golden age of humanity is yet to come, he declared, and it will be found in the perfection of the social order. The French Revolution having cleared the ground for a new organization of society, the duty of the present is to aid in effecting the beginning of this reorganization.*

St. Simon set forth his views in a number of works, namely, in his *Briefe eines Einwohners von Genf,* later in *L'Organisateur,* in *Système Industriel,* in *Catechisme des Industriels,* and finally in *Neues Christentum.* After his death his disciples, especially St. Amand Bazard and Barthelmy Prosper Enfantin, developed and extended their master's teachings. It was St. Simonism as interpreted by these men that Heine came into contact with when he arrived in Paris in 1831.

This social reform movement was then in its most flourishing state. It was being vigorously disseminated by lectures, both public and private.

---

*F. A. Ogg, *Social Progress in Contemporary Europe,* CHAPTER XXII, 343.

Two publications, the *Organisateur* and the *Globe* were carrying on an active propaganda for the spread of the faith. A strong effort to win the people and to organize the laborers was being made.

Heine came into personal contact with many of the leaders of this cult. With Michael Chevalier his relations were especially close. Enfantin he declared to be the most significant spirit of the time. Owing however to the manner in which St. Simonism was being set before the German people either by persons poorly informed or else malicious, he deemed it advisable to refrain from a public and complete union with St. Simonism, and expressly disclaimed any such connection.

Within a few months of Heine's arrival in Paris St. Simonism began to decline rapidly. In November 1831 the two principal leaders, Bazard and Enfantin, disagreed upon the matter of a new code of ethics and the question of the emancipation of women. Bazard withdrew from the movement and with him went many others of prominence. The desertion of still others weakened the society. Enfantin and a few faithful followers endeavored to maintain the sect. A trial instituted in August 1832 against Enfantin and the remaining St. Simonians however resulted in the final breaking up of the sect, the imprisonment of Enfantin and two of his pupils, and the levying of a fine upon them.

Heine's sympathies for the school of the St. Simonians, far from decreasing on account of the latter's misfortunes, increased with their difficulties. Not sharing all their beliefs, he yet did not consider them worthy of punishment. To him they were a party of liberals fighting for progress and for emancipation from an old regime. His book, *Über Deutschland,* he dedicated to Enfantin, and in it he advanced views very similar to those of the St. Simonians. Shortly after in his French edition of *Reisebilder*

he openly declared the basic social and religious principles of St. Simonism to be his own.

It is now time to consider a little more in detail just what the system of St. Simonism was, and with what features of it Heine was especially interested.*

St. Simonism possesses as perhaps its most significant side, an economic system that has for its purpose the using of all economic laws discovered by the learned for the alleviation of human needs in their broadest reaches. Observed from this standpoint, St. Simonism presents a scientific reconstruction of the state, which should be changed so as to rest upon a powerful organization of labor as a basis. The state, it was maintained, should assume control of the production and distribution of goods. A central bank should be established in which all the money should be placed after all needs had been satisfied. This economic phase of St. Simonism appears not to have interested Heine greatly. He was not one to whom the practical scientific side of the teaching appealed strongly, although this was the feature that attracted a number of practical minded persons who were desirous of scientific methods, and it was this side of St. Simonism which contributed later on to the development of the credit system and the institution of public works.

St. Simonism possessed also a social doctrine, and by this Heine was strongly influenced. It attacked the old social order which Heine also

---

*The following discussion of St. Simonism and Heine's relation to it is based principally upon the following references:

Henri Lichtenberger's *Heinrich Heine als Denker,* CHAPTER III.

J. Proelss, *Das Junge Deutschland,* pp. 174-182.

Heinrich Heines Sämtliche Werke, herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Ernst Elster, vol. I, INTRODUCTION, pp. 104-110.

opposed. It desired to take from the church, the nobility, and the judiciary their power and turn it over to the industrials and the learned. St. Simonism declared war upon the idle, the drones of society. It desired that all social adjustments should have for their goal the material and moral uplift of the more numerous and poorer classes. It would abolish all distinctions of birth. The exploitation of men by their fellows must cease unconditionally. In these aims of St. Simonism Heine joined heartily. He was opposed not only to the aristocracy of birth but also to all those who lived at the expense of the people.

But St. Simonism, while it would endeavor to do away with the old division into masters and slaves, into citizens and strangers, while it fought the power of individuals, the imposition of authority by force, and the exploitation of the masses by the powerful, did not advocate a condition of equality or of anarchy. Rather it would create a new system in which inequality would still exist, but this new inequality, unlike the old, should rest, not upon force, nor upon wealth, nor upon birth, but upon merit. Obedience should be rendered not through fear but from love. Reward should be the result of talent. Each should receive the fruit of his efforts and be secure from powerful or unscrupulous neighbors. A new order of rank would be created. This would include representatives of religion, science, and industry. The aristocrats of this society would owe their positions to their personal endowments alone. They would rule solely through the personal influence that they could exert. The authority that they would exercise by ruling in this way, St. Simon declared, would be greater than that of royal absolutism or of papal infallibility.

Thus in its essence St. Simonism was aristocratic. It was a rule to

be imposed from above, not to come from below, from the proletariat. The intellectual elite would become the rulers. Consequently it made its appeal to the middle and upper classes. It honored genius greatly. It held strongly to the "great-man" theory of history. It had a place for great, towering characters like Moses, Jesus, Mohammed, Charles the Great, Gregory VII, Luther, and Napoleon. At the top of the social structure erected by St. Simon there would be a sort of autocracy. The distinction between this and other autocracies would lie in the fact that obedience to this would be voluntary and joyful and rest upon a basis of love.

Heine was united with the St. Simonians in their desire to end the exploitation of the people. He also agreed with them in their belief in the necessity of a social hierarchy and in their reverence for genius. He himself did not believe in equality, and was an admirer of the first Napoleon. Hence he was delighted to discover a social scheme by which he could show that progress was possible without equality, that one could be democratic without denying individualism, and that the welfare of the common people could be united with the existence at the same time of such a ruler as Napoleon, who according to this system owed his rank to his genius and received but the reward of his talent.

Finally St. Simonism advanced a new revival of religion and morals. With this aspect of St. Simonism Heine was fully in accord. St. Simon in 1825 had issued his *Nouveau Christianisme*. In this work he sought to show the necessity for a reform of Christianity and the need of a new religious movement. He did not, however, like the materialistic philosophers of the eighteenth century and of the time of the revolution, see in religion merely a device of the priests to increase their power over a credulous people, a device that science would soon put an end to.

Rather he opposed this view of a future lacking religion, predicted the continuance of the religious feeling, and sought to support his system, not only upon philosophy and science but also "upon that most widespread religious feeling in the civilized world, namely the Christian."

At the same time he added a sharp criticism of Christianity as then existing. The mission of Christianity, he said, is to raise mankind as rapidly as possible, and lead men as quickly as may be toward their goal, namely, the bettering of the conditions of the lower classes. This catholic and protestant Christianity alike have failed to do. The great basic and indestructible principle of Christianity, brotherly love, which ought to lead men to action, has been ignored. Religion has become divorced from everyday life and affairs. The world and its interests have come to be regarded either as Godless or at least as not very well pleasing to God. Mystical ideas have been regarded as most effectual in furthering human progress, ascetic means, as prayer and fasting have been used, the Bible has been regarded as the sole source of truth. In short Christianity has opposed the world, taught falsely that the kingdom of God is not of this world, and has set a metaphysical goal, Paradise, as the highest aim of the faithful. "Certainly," concludes St. Simon, "all Christians are aspiring after eternal life, but the one way to reach it consists in this, to work in this life for the welfare of the human race."

Religion should try to better the conditions of the poor, to prevent their exploitation and oppression by the rich, and to oppose all institutions that stand in the way of the material and moral advancement of the poor. This the church has failed to do. It has sought the protection of the powerful and has united its interests with them against those of the masses. It has become self seeking. The same spirit has infected the

whole of society. From this has resulted the political disease which affects society.

St. Simon's ultimate aim was a reform of Christian ethics. He wished to fashion a new system of belief based upon what he considered to be the essential truths of Christianity after the dross which had accumulated about it had been purged. However his death occured before he had completed this and the task was taken up by two of his disciples, Bazard and Enfantin. These men developed the rather unclear thoughts of their master into a system and thus gave the final form to the new religion that St. Simon had only broadly outlined.

In most religions there is a form of dualism, a struggle between good and evil. This is found deeply permeating the Christian religion as well. Evil came into the world through the rebellion of the angels and the fall of our first parents. The consequence of this was the development of the doctrine of original sin. As this doctrine was first set forth, mind and body, spirit and flesh, were cursed alike. But as time progressed the spirit gradually became freed from this taint of sin; the sin of the flesh, on the other hand, became emphasized. This difference between the two constantly increased under Christianity. St. Simonism now proposed to unite that which Christianity had divided. Dualism was to be replaced by unity, opposition between spirit and flesh by cooperation. The flesh one thousand years under a ban, must be restored to a position of honor. "Man muss das Fleisch rehabilitieren," declared Enfantin, "Die ist die auffälligste und neueste Seite des Fortschrittes, zu dem die Menschheit heute berufen ist." The view of Christianity which had looked upon God as purely spiritual must be replaced by the view of a new religion in which God was both spiritual and material, omnipresent. Hence Enfantin ,

"Gott ist alles Seiende; alles ist in ihm, alles durch ihn. Nichts ist ausser ihm, aber keiner von uns ist er. Jeder von uns nimmt von seinem Leben teil, und wir alle vereingen uns in ihm, denn er ist alles, was ist." As thus developed St. Simonism was a sort of pantheistic monism.

Another phase of St. Simonism was the teaching advanced, more particularly by Enfantin, of the emancipation of women. Christianity, it was said, had preached equality of men; the new religion went a step further and preached the raising of women to an equality with men. Dependence of woman upon man must be shaken off. A reform of the marriage tie must be brought about. It was the means proposed by Enfantin for the accomplishment of this purpose that led to bitter attacks upon the St. Simonians, defections from their ranks, and finally to their breaking up as a society in Paris. The remedy proposed by him was free love.

Society as reorganized by St. Simon and his disciples would replace the separate worldly and spiritual power of state and church by a single power, a priest-king or overlord of mankind. Distinctions ages old between rich and poor, between strong and weak, would be abolished. True equality and brotherly love would be ushered in. Mankind would be united in a world bond, in a gigantic, voluntary hierarchy. Christianity in its ethics and in its historical role was subjected to a severe criticism, but was not destroyed. Finally the rehabilitation of the flesh was held up as a great dogma of the new religion.

With all these principles Heine was in full accord. He was an advocate of progress and of change. St. Simonism promised these. He had broken with the church of the day but he believed in the church as a necessary and helpful institution for the world. St. Simonism proposed a reform of this institution. Heine was a man of ideals, interested in

art, science, literature, truth, beauty, and so on. St. Simonism recognized and held a place for all such. It exalted genius. All these features appealed to Heine and attracted him strongly. In a word he was pleased with St. Simonism because in it he had found not only arguments against the old ethics and religion with which he had broken, but also because he found in it new religious and moral ideals which he could make his own.

Heine combined the ideas which he had borrowed from St. Simonism with his former revolutionary ideas and his reminiscences of the Hegelian philosophy to form a great historical, philosophical, and literary system which appeared in the second chapter of *Salon* in 1834. In this he follows St. Simonism in its teachings of the formation of an ideal society, which shall cast aside dogma but not become atheistic, which shall proclaim the emancipation of the flesh but not be materialistic, which shall be founded upon needs but not deny a place to art and beauty, which shall break the power of priests and despots but not destroy natural inequalities or endeavor to reduce all to a plane of pure equality. In these aims Heine concurs fully. But in one respect he differs and differs sharply. The St. Simonians had their ideal state all planned. They expected merely to demonstrate the superiority of this form of society and at once to be able to put it into effect. Heine did not believe this could be so easily done. He believed the new state could be ushered in only by a revolution. The power of the existing state, the conservative and reactionary forces, would all oppose such a change. Any attempt to impose such a system upon Germany Heine predicted would result in a revolution compared to which the French revolution would seem but child's play. But that such a revolution would come, he seems to have been certain, because of the tendency of the Germans to follow out any line of argument or of action to a logi-

cal conclusion, and this end appeared to him to be the inevitable one.

Briefly to sum up a few conclusions with regard to Heine and St. Simonism: Heine was much more strongly influenced by the ethical and religious side of its teachings than he was by the social and economic side. The need for a rehabilitation of the flesh and the emancipation of women appealed to him forcibly. These aspects of St. Simonism he naturally emphasized in his writings. His influence in Germany was exceedingly strong and widespread. The younger generation of writers looked to him as their leader and their model. Naturally enough then the period of the Young German movement in literature reflected to a large extent, not only liberal and semi-revolutionary ideas and tendencies, but also the socialistic ideas of St. Simonism as these were introduced into Germany by Heine.

CHAPTER III.

***

Gutzkow and St. Simonism.

***

The preceding chapters have taken up in some detail the historical background of the period during which the writers of Young Germany were most active, they have sketched briefly the principal forces, industrial, social, and economic, that contributed toward moulding the literature of the time, and they have also laid especial emphasis upon the influence of French social and revolutionary ideas as these were made known to German writers through the works of Heinrich Heine. The deep impression which St. Simonism made upon this journalist has been noted, and it has been further stated that he in turn exercised a decided influence upon the views of the Young Germans.

Nearly all of these writers seized upon Heine's ideas with avidity. Laube in his *Das junge Deutschland* not only set forth many of the same views advanced by Heine, but closely imitated the latter's style as well. The principal elements in Mundt's *Maaonna* were the St. Simonian doctrines of the emancipation of the flesh, and the emancipation of women, together with an attack upon the Catholic church. The literature of the day teemed with expressions taken from the St. Simonian teaching. Such phrases as emancipation of the flesh, emancipation of the senses, emancipation of women, were everywhere in the air. This was the form that liberalism, checked so thoroughly in other directions, assumed in order to secure a hearing for itself.

Foremost among those whose writings reflect these tendencies was Karl Gutzkow, whose relation to St. Simonism is now to be considered. He became the real leader of the Young Germans following the breaking away of these writers from their dependence upon Heine. In order to show in a general way the importance of Gutzkow in this movement, a brief sketch is here given of his literary career.

Karl Gutzkow is one of the few natives of Berlin to acquire a high place in German literature. Born March 17, 1811, he grew up in the capital city, received there his education, and although the greater part of his active life was spent elsewhere, he always preserved a warm feeling toward his native city, and in a number of instances, as for example in *Ritter vom Geiste* and *Aus der Knabenzeit*, he made it the scene of his writings.

Few men of letters have had as varied a career as he, few have delved into so many departments of literary activity, and few have influenced the thought of their generation to as great an extent. He was alike successful as a journalist, a dramatist, a critic, and a novellist. In the last of these fields he was a pioneer, his *Ritter vom Geiste* being generally acknowledged as the first of the modern type of social novel in Germany. He was one of the greatest journalists of the last century, experienced, far-seeing, industrious, equipped with knowledge of all sorts, the leader of the intellectual army which fought for the greatest political and social ideas of modern times. No one lived closer to the movements of his time or probably understood them better than he. Gutzkow's works are a journal of the history of his time. There was scarcely a question that he did not touch upon, scarcely an historical personality of any importance with whom he did not have some relation, either personal, by letter, or in his

capacity as critic.*

Such a man was not apt to overlook a social question of the magnitude and public appeal of that presented by St. Simonism. The relation that he sustained toward this movement and the attitude that he bore toward it, are to be found expressed most clearly and at greatest length in his novel *Wally*, (1835), in *Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, (1839), his contribution toward the history of Young Germany, and in an article entitled *Die Existenz*, included in the collection called *Säkularbilder*, first published in 1837 under the title *Zeitgenossen*.

We have seen that one of the prominent features of St. Simonism was its sharp criticism of Christianity. This attack was not confined in its scope to this socialistic school and its adherents, but was a part of a widespread attack then being waged against the prevailing orthodoxy. Strauss's *Leben Jesu*, which appeared early in 1835, became the storm center of the warring factions in Germany. In his criticism of the Bible Strauss went far beyond Lessing, Reimarus, the Rationalists, or Schleiermacher. He employed the scientific method of historical criticism and endeavored to prove that the whole of the gospel narrative was based upon a foundation of myth and allegory. Many rallied to this viewpoint, and naturally the clergy opposed it strongly. As might be expected it was not long before a bitter conflict was raging between the two groups.°

Gutzkow was not one to stand idly by in such a struggle. He was just then at the beginning of his literary career, eager to enter the lists and gain a place for himself. It was with the publication of his *Briefe eines Narren an eine Närrin* in 1832, and the satirical, philosophical novel

---

*Cf. Dr. H. H. Houben, *Gutzkow Funde*, Vorrede VII.

°J. Proelss, *Das Junge Deutschland*, p. 569.

Maha Guru in the following year that he took his place among the critics of the orthodox religion.

In *Briefe eines Narren an eine Närrin* he attacked the conception of dualism which exists in the Christian religion.* This doctrine, it will be remembered, was severely criticised by St. Simonism, while the corollary to which its denial naturally led, the rehabilitation of the flesh, was vigorously upheld by it. In *Maha Guru* his description of the ecclesiastical state in Tibet is a veiled attack upon the Christian hierarchy in Europe. Without the author's definite statement that such is the case, it can be readily seen that the fundamental, underlying thought is that of the triumph of a natural, human enjoyment in life over an erroneous idea of imagined godliness.° It is the conflict between sensualism and asceticism which is here depicted.

Gutzkow had grown up in the atmosphere of pietism. Religion, as he had seen it in the lives of those around him, was to a large degree a matter of form and of ceremonial. It lacked spirit and life. He had come to look upon religion as being in a large degree synonymous with hypocrisy. The church he believed to be an outgrown institution, something that having failed in its mission was no longer of value and required replacement by some other institution. His views in this regard were for a time exceedingly radical and in his expression of them he was blunt and lacking in tact. It remained characteristic of Gutzkow throughout his career that he paid comparatively little attention to literary form. He was much more concerned with the content of his productions than he was with the artistic expression of his ideas. His attitude toward the

---

*Dr. August Caselmann, *Karl Gutzkows Stellung zu den religiös-ethischen Problemen seiner Zeit*, p. 28.

°Dr. August Caselmann, loc. cit., p. 29.

church always remained one of criticism, although his hostility came to be expressed in less virulent terms as he grew older and his views broadened. Thus it was quite natural that Gutzkow, already prejudiced against the church, his views on religion those that he had acquired from association with pietistic surroundings, a young man feeling within him great powers for literary expression, and barred from giving utterance to these in a political way, should turn to the battle then raging between reactionary clericalism and radical liberalism and endeavor to win recognition by his vigorous onslaughts against the ruling orthodoxy. This is the tendency that characterizes his early works and which marks one of the paths which his liberalism took.

Very soon after Schleiermacher's death Gutzkow learned that the prominent clergy of Berlin were preparing to have a new edition of Schleiermacher's works published, but that they proposed to exclude from this the latter's *Vertraute Briefe über Schlegels Lucinae*. Schleiermacher had in these letters discussed with considerable freedom and yet with dignified moderation the relation of the sexes, the same thing which Laube had treated in his *Poeten*, Mundt in his *Madonna*, and Kühne in his *Quarantäne*, and for which Heine had borrowed from the St. Simonians the catchword of emancipation of the flesh when he had introduced that doctrine into Germany.* The clergy now proposed to overlook these early liberal views of Schleiermacher, and to regard these letters as a youthful folly of the man whom they claimed as their leader, and to exclude them from his collected works. In all this Gutzkow saw a chance to strike a blow at the clergy, from whom he was already estranged, by issuing a new edition of the *Briefe* to which he added a preface that showed Schleiermacher in the

*J. Proelss, *Das Junge Deutschland*, p. 552.

light of a champion of the emancipation of the flesh. He also went further than this, and in this preface voiced a demand for the freeing of the marriage ceremony from the exclusive control of the church, and urged that marriage be made a civil rite. The final result of this preface was to create the impression upon the public that Gutzkow was an antagonist of religion, and an adherent of the unhealthy emancipation of women for which the name of George Sand was at that time the symbol in the eyes of the world.*

The publication of *Wally, die Zweiflerin* in August 1835 tended to strengthen this belief in the minds of the public. This work contained a severe attack upon the Christian religion, was permeated by the doctrine of the glorification of the flesh, advocated strongly that the sacrament of marriage be taken from the exclusive control of the church and made a civil rite, and finally closed with a reference to St. Simonism and to Lamenais' *Worte eines Gläubigen.*

The influence of Strauss and Heine upon this work of Gutzkow's is marked. It appeared very quickly after the *Leben Jesu* of the former and the second volume of the latter's *Salon.* The part which Strauss's book played in the religious controversy has already been described, and it was from Heine's *Salon* with its distinction between Nazerenertum and the pleasure loving Hellenes, and with its St. Simonian gospel of the emancipation of the flesh, that Gutzkow drew much of his inspiration for similar tendencies in *Wally.*

In the attack that Gutzkow here makes upon the church and the Christian religion, he is but continuing the course which we have already ob-

---

*Dr. August Caselmann, *Karl Gutzkows Stellung zu den religiös-ethischen Problemen seiner Zeit,* pp. 33-35.

served in his previously mentioned works. Now however he devotes greater space to this polemic, constructs his argument upon an historical basis, and criticises with greater sharpness than before. The severe criticism that is directed against the church and religion is worthy of consideration here because of the way in which it ends. The author starts out with the definition that "religion is despair of a world purpose." Did mankind but know the final aim and purpose of the universe with its individual component parts, there would be no necessity for religion. Proceeding from this point a theory of the natural origin of religion is first given, then the adaptation of the conception of deity to the prevailing stage of civilization is taken up, and finally the impossibility of historical religions in the light of increasing knowledge is claimed to be proven. Without entering into any further discussion of this part of the author's reasoning, we pass to the conclusions which he draws. Christianity has lost its power and its utility. Mankind no longer possesses faith in the Christian religion. A portion of the world will no doubt still cling to it for some time, but healthy, thoughtful minds will seek for some new spiritual system to which to attach their faith, for the age is not godless, rather it is Christless. Hence, says Gutzkow, the various new movements, sects, and religions of various kinds which are springing up. At this point he specifically mentions St. Simonism and Lamenais' *Worte eines Gläubigen.*

In order to show Gutzkow's attitude toward these two social-religious systems the following is quoted from the chapter *Geständnisse über Religion und Christentum.**

**Gutzkows Werke* herausgegeben von Peter Müller, vol. II, p. 303, line 19, to p. 304, line 13.

"In both of these systems, (referring to St. Simonism and Lamenais' *Worte eines Gläubigen*), the political tendency of the century is first considered. The shamelessness which would refer starving workers to the heavenly bread of eternal life has here been avoided. The religion of renunciation may do for those years when harvests fail, but when plenty and extravagance abound, mankind rebels against a religion which forever lays stress upon resignation, upon humility, and upon dependence upon the will of God. Of that phase of Christianity which opposes the spirit of the times, there can be no longer any consideration. The difference between these two systems consists in this: that St. Simonism regards Christianity as antiquated, and seeks to replace it by a combination of materialistic philosophy with certain institutions retained from the old faith, while the *Worte eines Gläubigen*, on the other hand, return to the democratic origin of Christianity and reveal clearly a republican tendency in Christianity. St. Simonism wishes to separate the state from the church. The *Worte eines Gläubigen* desire to free the church from the state. The one points toward the future, the other toward the past. Both suffer from similar defects: St. Simonism from philosophical vagaries, Lamenais from Roman Catholicism. How can one pronounce judgment briefly on both movements? In themselves they are not revolutions, they are but symptoms. St. Simonism betrays a need of humanity; the *Worte eines Gläubigen* seek to satisfy it, but they do this only in part."

From these words we see that Gutzkow did not necessarily regard either or both of these French socialistic propagandas as the panacea for social ills. His attitude however is that of one who looks favorably upon both. He sees in them the recognition of a great need of humanity and an attempt to satisfy this need. The Christian doctrine of self denial is cast aside,

the material welfare of the laboring classes is placed first in importance of the St. Simonian doctrines, but the new faith, he thinks, suffers from a lack of clearness and from too complicated a philosophy. Lamenais' *Worte eines Gläubigen* is also unclear and too strongly Catholic in its tendencies. The value of St. Simonism and the *Worte eines Gläubigen* lies not in themselves and the revolutions that they may effect, but in their importance as symptoms of the age, as straws showing in which direction the winds of change and progress are blowing. This is the extent of what Gutzkow has to say with regard to these new appearances. It is not a great deal. In *Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, (1839), he contributes a very valuable addition to the history of the Young German movement, and in this he gives us some information in regard to the extent of his knowledge of St. Simonism at the time *Wally* was written, tells us where he acquired some of his liberal views, and opens before us his reasons for writing productions with the marked tendencies that characterize his works at this time. In the few years between 1835 and 1839 Gutzkow had had time for reflection and the first burst of enthusiasm had passed leaving him in a condition to form more intelligently grounded opinions on the subjects handled by the Young Germans during the hottest of the fight.

In his sketch *Theodor Mundt* he gives us the source of his information in regard to the doctrine of the rehabilitation of the flesh. He says, "I humbly confess that I first learned the doctrine of the rehabilitation of the flesh from him (Mundt) after I had long written in its favor, and that I first found this doctrine in the *Madonna*." Mundt, he continues, had studied St. Simonism thoroughly and understood it perfectly. Of himself he says, "I swam in a world of new ideas, but I had not discovered as many firm islands in it as Mundt." Mundt incorporated these St. Simon-

ian ideas into a fanciful scheme for a new social system. Gutzkow used then rather as a basis for an attack upon the old. Again, quoting from the same source, "I had attacked the old customs and ridiculed them with a malicious joy, because those whom they protected, the priests, the princes, and the Philistines, I hated. I did not wish to annoy the good people but rather the hypocrites." Here he expresses again his attitude of hostile criticism toward the clergy.

Das Junge Deutschland is a valuable contribution as showing Gutzkow's feelings toward this group and its productions. Young Germany was, he declares, the necessary reaction to the then existing conditions. The effect of the July revolution, of the Polish uprising, the repressed revolutionary forces in other places, the new social philosophy in France, the attempt of Lamenais to unite religion and politics, the St. Simonistic attempt to found a new society, these he declares, were enough to ignite a conflagration in the sultry atmosphere of Germany. The Young Germans wrote so fervidly and with so little reserve because under the influence of the then existing environment they could not avoid doing so. The harsh judgment and criticism which greeted their writings Gutzkow looked to see reversed by succeeding generations of readers and critics.

The chapter *Gedanken im Kerker* is interesting in that it shows the effect produced upon Gutzkow by the news that his works were henceforth to be proscribed in Prussia. He describes how he became intensely interested in public affairs and longed for a free expression of the thoughts that were burning within him. It seemed that only thus could he regain peace of mind. As other writers have often written chapters of their life experience into books and thus have been able to recover their normal poise, so Gutzkow wrote his *Wally*. He was hardly to be considered as an

ardent partisan or propagandist. He wrote because he felt impelled to, not for any deliberate purpose of championing new doctrines, if we accept his own statements at their face value. He says, "I was not conscious of a purpose, not even of that best of all purposes, conviction. It was not a conscious purpose which caused me to write *Wally*. My mind demanded peace. The last convulsion, like a volcanic eruption, had to come before I could secure this. Of St. Simonism, of the rehabilitation of the flesh, of Young Germany, I know nothing of all these. I know only my heart, my life, my dead."

The best presentation of Gutzkow's views on St. Simonism is found in an article entitled *Die Existenz*,* one of a series of sketches issued in 1837 while their author's works were still under the ban in Germany, and for that reason given out under the name of *Bulwers Zeitgenossen*, Bulwer being the supposed English author of the article. Subsequently they were republished under the title *Säkularbilder* in 1846 under the name of the author, the prohibition on his works having been lifted in the meantime.

This article takes up a discussion of St. Simonism at considerable length. It appears from this that, unlike Heine, Gutzkow was much more strongly interested in the political and industrial phases of St. Simonism than he was in the doctrine of the emancipation of woman, the rehabilitation of the flesh, and other similar tendencies that attached themselves to this system. The attitude that Gutzkow assumes toward St. Simonism is important in this connection. He is neither an opponent nor a partisan; rather he tries to judge impartially. He states it as his belief that in spite of its great imperfection, St. Simonism is worthy of careful consideration.

---

*H. Costenoble, *Gesammelte Werke von Karl Gutzkow*, vol. VIII, pp. 142-148.

Heine regarded Enfantin as one of the greatest personalities of his time. Gutzkow calls him "a wily Cagliostro." All that is either ridiculous or shameless in the St. Simonian teaching is to be placed to Enfantin's account. It is his folly and rashness which has ruined the new social structure. Enfantin had desired to become a pope before his church was yet in existence. He is the one who invented the doctrines of the emancipation of woman, the emancipation of the flesh, principles neither set forward by St. Simon nor countenanced by all of Enfantin's colleagues, and the result of whose introduction has contributed to transform the new faith into a street show. That which was the original teaching of St. Simon, Gutzkow declares, was not obliged to flee from Europe into the wilds of the Suez, but remained in Europe where it still exerted an influence although under a different form.

St. Simonism as a new form of religious faith is viewed favorably by Gutzkow. Christianity has devoted its attention to the needs of the soul. The needs of the body have been neglected. St. Simonism purposes to bring about an harmonious relationship between the interests of both. It would effect a compromise between the physical and the moral elements in human existence. This is the same idea that we have already seen expressed in *Wally*.

The mission of St. Simonism is to raise the working classes to a higher intellectual and moral state. This it has not yet done, but it has pointed out the only means by which this may be accomplished, namely: by the freeing of the lower classes of society from the present fearful pressure of the struggle for existence. The various means proposed by St. Simon for securing this result, such as the agrarian schemes of antiquity and the apostolic community of goods, are excellent devices for this

end if applied first to small communities and then gradually extended in their scope. One reason for the failure of St. Simonism has been the attempt on the part of its leaders, notably Enfantin, to extend the scope of their teachings at once over a whole nation. They desired to rule while as yet they had no people.

Having stated the purpose of St. Simonism as he conceives it, Gutzkow proceeds to set forth its cardinal principle. This is the freedom of the individual. Man is a person, not a thing. It is this conception of man as a thing possessing an objective value, that has been the prime source of all social evils in human history, from the time of the first tyranny of the hunter over the primitive agriculturalist down to the present great landlords, who are in a sense still hunters, because their overseers, laborers, and other dependents must serve them as things. Slavery, serfdom, and wage labor mark the three steps up which individual freedom has slowly climbed, and which have brought about a certain amelioration of conditions, but have not as yet caused the relinquishment of the principle of slavery. St. Simonism purposes neither to do away with labor nor with its payment, but does propose a new method of payment and a new measure for the same. This new method is payment by the state from a common treasury, the new measure is that of reward according to ability or talent. It is this principle, reward according to ability or for services, that Gutzkow declares is the foundation of St. Simonism. Also it is the revolutionary germ from which communism has its origin, because it strikes at the concept of private property. When reward according to services obtains, the right of inheritance falls. Each can receive then only what he himself earns. With the right of private property and of inheritance swept away the individual becomes dependent upon the state

and upon his own efforts. The relation sustained formerly by the father toward the child is lost. Each individual must endeavor to advance himself. Inheritance as the underlying cause of all national calamities must be given up. Each shall receive reward according to his talents.

Up to this point in his analysis of St. Simonism Gutzkow has not disagreed markedly with its principles. He looks upon it as fantastic but not exactly unsafe in its tendencies. It is the new construction of society that St. Simonism would introduce that he objects to vigorously. A state in which the priests should be at the same time the leaders of the church and also civil officials immediately arouses his antagonism. Such a state cannot rest upon sound principles. The power of this new hierarchy is too great. To be sure the educated and the artists are given a favored place, but the power of the clergy in their capacities as teachers, preachers, and law givers is too predominating to gain Gutzkow's approval. This alone, he says, is the cause of the collapse of St. Simonism permitting Fourierism and communism to take its place. Again the fact that St. Simonism when driven from France fled to the Orient is in itself a proof of its weakness. Had its leaders gone to North America, where life is stern and the struggle for existence severe, they would have shown that their system was in earnest in what it was attempting. But in going to the indolent and sensual Orient it showed itself essentially the product of an inflamed, almost lustful, and at the same time, sluggish imagination. Of this there is no longer any question, he asserts.

Thus far Gutzkow has found three grounds upon which he condemns St. Simonism. The first is the impossibility of practically carrying it into execution, the second is its concealed hierarchical tendency, and finally he claims it lacks the vitality and the strength of moral purpose to make

it a world force.

However he does not pass a final judgment upon it. After mentioning several current objections such as the fear that such a system would result in making men into mere machines, it might cause the overthrow of science, or do away with art, he makes the statement that these questions do not interest him strongly. In deciding for or against such a social reform movement the question which should be asked is rather a question of how best to secure the greatest good of all. A new social system might result in producing conditions such that no such finely individualized and original characters would develop as under present conditions, but the general level for all might be raised. Would it not be better, he says, that there should never be a Shakespeare than that on his account the harmony of a happy existence for the many should be hindered? Would it not be better that we should all be unknown and follow the plow than that on our account an aristocracy of minds should be established which should demand the sacrifice of ninety out of every hundred?

With these questions he leaves the discussion of St. Simonism. The author's answer to them is an emphatic affirmative. His attitude toward St. Simonism is not so certain however. It would appear that he did not consider that this system contained the necessary elements to rejuvenate society. Here as in *Wally* he has raised a question and left it to the reader to decide the answer for himself. But he has plainly indicated what he considers to be the proper criterion for arriving at a judgment, and this criterion is, what will contribute to the greatest good of society. In the light of this query must all dicisions with regard to the public welfare be made. This is the supreme test, and no selfish interests should be permitted to intervene in reaching a conclusion.

From what has been given above, it is now possible to draw some inferences with regard to Gutzkow's general attitude toward St. Simonism. It is quite apparent in the first place that Gutzkow never openly allied himself with the followers of St. Simon, but that in his relation toward St. Simonism he always maintained the position of a critic. He was strongly influenced by it as his writings show, but not to such an extent that he saw in it a panacea for all social ills. The part of its teaching which most strongly appealed to him was its political and industrial program. With the humanitarian purposes of St. Simonism he was heartily sympathetic. The desire to raise the standard of the well being of the laboring classes he approved strongly. The greater freedom and more enjoyment in life for the industrial classes that St. Simonism wished to secure were in accord with his own social views. That which he considered to be the pure teaching of St. Simon he approved nearly as a whole. The new social order which would exist in the state, however, and which would grant a predominating influence to the clergy he strongly disapproved. The various tendencies included under the general term of rehabilitation of the flesh, he also opposed. The emancipation of women he calls the most absurd idea that the age has produced. Enfantin as the author of these tendencies is especially odious to him, and Gutzkow holds him in no small degree responsible for the failure of St. Simonism and the disrepute into which the latter had fallen. Gutzkow was not carried away by his enthusiasm for this social scheme as was Heine. He never entered heart and soul into its aims. He regarded not as a movement of great significance in itself, but was interested in it as a surface agitation indicative of a deep unrest in the social organism of the age. He viewed it from the standpoint of a journalist and student of sociology rather

than from the standpoint of an ardent adherent or a propagandist.

CHAPTER IV

***

Die Ritter vom Geiste.

***

Gutzkow has already been referred to as a pioneer in the field of the modern German social novel. There are but two conspicuous attempts to be observed previous to the appearance of his *Ritter vom Geiste*. These are Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister,* which is of the utmost importance in that it really forms the basis of the modern novel, and Immerman's *Epigonen,* which is virtually the last of the Romantic novels for which Goethe's work served as a model. In both of these there is an ethical background. A struggle between the new industrial classes and the old aristocracy is depicted.* Modern social conditions are foreshadowed. The beginnings of the struggle between capital and labor may be seen.

The French novelist Eugene Sue also exercised a marked influence upon Gutzkow. In 1842 to 1843 the former issued his *Geheimnisse von Paris,* and in 1844 to 1845 *Der Ewige Jude* was given to the world. These works attained an immense popularity, and their unusual success can be attributed to two qualities, the purpose for which they were written and their technique.° The purpose was social, the aim of the writer being to awaken pity for the poor and unfortunate, and even more than this, to arouse a hatred against the rich and the favored. The technique showed itself in the manysided appeal which was presented to the reader. The

---

*J. G. Robertson, *A History of German Literature,* p. 477.

°Richard M. Meyer, *Die deutsche Litteratur des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts,* p. 225.

author traversed the whole gamut of social conditions, revealing alike the poverty and squalor of the poor and the luxury and extravagance of the rich. These novels were quickly translated into foreign languages and were widely imitated as well. The inner life of the great cities of Europe was laid bare in all its hideousness, and no attempt was made to shift the blame for the awful conditions that existed in these metropolitan centers. For the first time the evils as well as the benefits of the new industrial regime were clearly depicted.

Gutzkow's contribution to this type of literature appeared in 1850 to 1851 in the form of the large, nine-volume social novel *Ritter vom Geiste*. Both in the serial form in which it was first published and in the later appearing book it was a decided success. The scene of the action was located in Berlin, a city with which Gutzkow was familiar from childhood. The period described is that of the reaction following the revolution of 1848. The harsh, unsympathetic, and cruelly repressive policy of the Prussian government of these years is well portrayed. The novel is quite satirical and several of the characters are evidently based upon men prominent in official circles of the time. These features naturally increased the interest in the work and aided its success.

Gutzkow considered *Ritter vom Geiste* to be his best production, and with this judgment critics have generally agreed. In it is contained the essence of what its author had to offer to his generation along ethical, political, and social lines. Here are to be found, expressed in a temperate, considerate manner, most of the ideas and principles for which in his varied career as a journalist and a man of letters he had waged an active warfare. Throughout his life he stood consistently for certain definite fundamentals and from these he never turned away. In one respect

he did change, however, and this was in the direction which experience and maturity usually lead one toward. In this novel the rashness and impetuosity so characteristic of his earlier writings have been largely outgrown. The unreflective, hasty judgments of his storm and stress period have here been discarded and in their place calmer and more thoughtful views are to be found. The heaven storming propensities of the young novice just making his entrance into the field of literature, as seen in the *Vorrede* to Schleiermacher's letters and in *Wally*, have been curbed and brought under control. At the same time the spirit which prompted these former outbursts is still present. The same desire for greater individual freedom, for liberalism in government, for national unity and independence, for progress, for freedom from the trammels of orthodoxy and the galling restraints of the conservatism of the past, these are still guiding principles from which no retreat has been sounded.

Ritter vom Geiste is a social novel, but it cannot be said to be socialistic. It stands for democratic principles, but it advocates no specific form of government. It calls for progress and reform, but it provides no definite and adequate machinery for achieving these results. It maintains the nobility of labor and the rights of the common man, but it does not propose to alleviate social conditions by means of a proletariat uprising. It proposes to change men's relations to one another, but it does not seek the overthrow of the existing government. It would bring about a more harmonious relationship between capital and labor, and between the ruling and the ruled, but it would do this by the application of the altruistic principles of love and forebearance rather than by means of legislation or of physical force. In short, the ideal presented in *Ritter vom Geiste* is that of a transformed society in which men should be

actuated by the principle of service for others rather than by motives of self interest. The exact status which would result is difficult to learn. The whole scheme is surrounded by a certain haziness and a lack of detail which is at once its greatest defect and its chief virtue. It is a defect in so far as its indefiniteness of structure renders a clear judgment difficult, and it is a virtue in that it affords a degree of flexibility that a minutely detailed plan often lacks.

Thus we can hardly apply the same rules of criticism in examining the new structure of society that Gutzkow presents to us in *Ritter vom Geiste* that we can use in discussing St. Simonism and other forms of socialism. We are not given in this case a full-fledged, completely outlined system to criticise. We have but a vaguely indicated skeleton structure to which we ourselves must add the flesh and blood from our own imagination and personal interpretation. Nevertheless the study of the novel is of value in aiding one to obtain a better insight into Gutzkow's political, social, and ethical views, and it is from this standpoint largely that the following observations are made.

The scheme which Gutzkow builds up in this novel for the reorganization of society is based upon the following premises. Mankind, he says, has been placed in this world unprotected and without a leader. A severe struggle is necessary in order to secure even a bare subsistence, not to speak of comfort or luxury. Men are like hungry beasts who prey upon one another in order to maintain their own existence. Religion, moral codes, conscience, kindly temperament, these are factors that mitigate only slightly the harshness of the struggle. There is but one great universal bond uniting men, and that is the bond of a common humanity. But this in itself is not very potent. Hence the various associations of men into

fraternal organizations, churches, sects, and the like, in order to free themselves as far as possible from the restrictions of this existence. All this betrays a deep and ancient need of humanity.

Religion, and Christianity in particular, has been the most conspicuous attempt to satisfy this need. Founded upon the principle of brotherly love Christianity started out upon its mission. Very soon, however, it lost its original purpose and became a visible agency, a world in itself, a protection to no one. It split up into a number of confessions and sects, associations in which the spirit was dead. Hence religion can no longer be looked to as a means for satisfying humanity's need. It has fallen from its high estate and has passed beyond the point of resuscitation.

Similarly the state forms no union of mankind. Society is cold and loveless. Princes treat their subjects as they would inherited property, for purposes of exploitation and profit only. Life has become one great danger. The weak are powerless before the greed and the might of the crafty and the unscrupulous. The condition is one characterized by pessimism and despair. The burden of existence presses heavily upon men's shoulders. Hope of better times has fled. Life is esteemed but lightly. Suicides are common and death is sought as a favored alternative to a dreary hopeless existence.

It is a dark picture that Gutzkow paints, and yet it possesses an historical basis. It is only the counterpart in many respects to the actual state of affairs in Prussia during the reaction following the revolution of 1848. It is a bitter condemnation of the oppressive police regime of this period, a scathing rebuke to the kind of government that maintained itself only by means of a standing army, and prevented the

dissemination of liberal principles by muzzling the press. Beneath the mask of a social novel one can see the ardent leader of the Young German movement still waging his old warfare against the deadening power of tradition, conservatism, and autocracy.

Having painted for us this sombre picture, we now come to ask what solution Gutzkow has to offer for the conditions he has presented. We have already seen that he placed no faith in the system of Christianity as a world reform measure. Neither could the state act as a force to unite society and lift it to a higher level. Furthermore he openly disclaimed belief in the power of any individual Messiah to become a savior of the race. What then does he advocate?

It is at this point that Gutzkow differs radically from our present day socialists. He does not attack the form of government directly and demand its overthrow in order to usher in his new state. Neither does he advocate an uprising of the proletariat that shall abolish class distinctions, and sweep away the control of the government from the aristocracy or the bourgeoisie, and place it in the hands of the masses. He stands for no doctrines that are definitely socialistic. As a matter of fact his own words prove that he was firmly opposed to the scheme outlined by Karl Marx, and he openly expressed the hope that this socialistic scheme would forever remain a Utopia.*

The demands which he actually presents in *Ritter vom Geiste* are not at all radical when viewed from our present standpoint, although they might well appear so to the hidebound reactionaries of that time. In the first place the industrial classes must cease to be looked down upon, and labor must be exalted to a position of honor. Freedom of the press, an

*Cf. preface to Sixth Edition of *Ritter vom Geiste*.

essential in any free government, must also be guaranteed. Human rights as defined and fought for in the French Revolution must be granted and safeguards provided against any infringement upon them. The state must cease to oppress its subjects, and must no longer rest its power upon a basis of military or police strength. The principle of brotherly love must replace that of fear as a ruling motive. These are the fundamental concepts upon which Gutzkow would erect his new society, the corner stones which he would lay in his structure of human freedom.

As has already been stated, Gutzkow did not advocate the formation of a political party to enter the lists as the champion of this bill of rights. Neither did he desire that a violent cataclysm similar to that of the French Revolution should be the means by which society should be reformed, for bloodshed was not a part of his program and armies were to play no role in the Utopia that he wished to create. In this respect he differs most radically from those socialists who believe that only thus can the new social order be introduced.

Ideas are that for which men should fight, Gutzkow believed. Ideas are what rule the world. It is ideas that sway men. The weapons of logic and of simple appeal, not the weapons of military warfare, must be used in this conflict. Intellectual prowess rather than physical force must determine the issue. Men must do right because it is right, not because they dare not do otherwise. They must come into the kingdom of the "knights of the spirit" from choice and not from compulsion. The emancipation of mankind must come about through a common devotion to high and lofty principles, not through a slavish subservience to the will of a monarch or of an oligarchy.

Gutzkow offered as the direct medium by which these results were to

be obtained an organization in the form of a secret order, modelled upon those of the Jesuits and the Freemasons, which should have these aims for its ideals. The requisites of a mechanical organization, such as a ritual, a form of symbolism, funds, and so on, were to be provided. A grand lodge and local lodges were to be established. Membership was to be by election upon recommendation from some already members. An active propaganda was to be started. New members were to be secured by personal efforts, not by public appeals. The rule was adopted at first that no names could be proposed by any one unless they were names of persons of higher social rank than the one proposing them. This was later amended to include superiority of any sort, moral, intellectual, or what not. The result of the amendment would be, of course, to extend the limits of possible membership indefinitely.

Essentially the new order was to be an upper or at least a middle class movement. It was Gutzkow's firm belief that society could be advanced only by means of the active cooperation of the elite. Reform could not be expected to come from the ruling class who were reaping profits from the existing conditions. Neither could it come from the masses as these lacked the inspiration and the uplift necessary to start such a movement. Moreover they were too greatly engrossed in the task of procuring a subsistence to take time or devote effort to such a reform. The regeneration of society could come, therefore, only as the result of the organized, intelligent cooperation of the more enlightened members of the social body, and education must be the principle means by which this must be effected.

The representatives of these ideas and principles in *Ritter vom Geiste* are five men , one from the legal profession, one an artist, one an

army officer, one a technologist, and one a skilled worker in a trade. A sixth, a scion of the nobility, holds much the same views as the five, but differs from the rest in regard to the manner of putting them into effect.

The five formed the secret organization referred to above, and commenced active efforts to increase their number and spread their ideas. The sixth is chosen prime minister and attempts to bring about certain reforms with regard to labor conditions, but fails to secure the support of the parliament, and is unable to accomplish anything. Throughout his term of office he opposes the efforts of the five whose secret organization he suspects is plotting against the government. The persecution becomes so severe that the former friends are forced to flee for safety.

The new order is dependent for its financial support upon the result of a trial instituted by two of its members to obtain a large amount of property which had originally belonged to an order of the crusading times, but which had later become secularized, and now is claimed as the inheritance of these two. The suit is successful and the new order comes into possession of a large amount of money which is paid in the form of paper currency. A fire destroys this, however, leaving the order without funds as before. This episode is significant in that it shows Gutzkow's belief that an organization devoted to the service of society must not be dependent for its effectiveness upon artificial means, but must contain within itself self-perpetuating and life-giving principles.

The apparent defeat which threatens the "knights of the spirit" is shown at the last to be illusory. The inner harmony and the concerted action which are necessary for the success of the desired reforms are secured. The novel closes with the promise of a bright future. All difficulties have not been removed, nor do the knights expect to bring about

the fulfillment of all their hopes within a few years. They have come to realize that the process will be long, but like many others who have aided the advance of progress they are willing to work and to wait.

As has been said, *Ritter vom Geiste* contains the best that Gutzkow has to give to the world. It cannot be said, however, that he has here advocated anything particularly new or striking. He has presented nothing for which parallels cannot be drawn from the events of the time. His meassage is not one of new ideals but it is rather one of inspiration and cheer. The hope which he entertained for the regeneration of society and the ushering in of a millenium is one that has ever flitted before the eyes of men and kept them from giving up in despair. The union of mankind in a common bond of sympathy and mutual helpfulness is but the fond dream of the ages.

One service he did render, however, of actual and original significance. As Proelss well says, "holding himself free from optimistic as well as pessimistic onesidedness, he nas shown our nation for the first time, how much misery and poverty, corruption and crime, as well as how much soundness and virtue is housed in the garrets and tne cellars of our great cities, conditions from which the genteel world has been accustomed to avert its glance. And he has unconstrainedly interwoven the life of the lowest strata of the people with the struggles after the ideals of national unity and the common welfare."

Without doubt Gutzkow penetrated more deeply than the other writers of his time into the misery and tne poverty produced by the introduction of the industrial regime. He saw probably more clearly than any other the deplorable extremes which existed in the social scale. He realized to the full the measure of the hatred and the distrust which was springing

up between the forces of labor and capital, and he saw the dire results which must inevitably come from this antipathy unless it were checked. The evils of autocratic and of bureaucratic government were no less evident to him. The plea for greater individual freedom, for more toleration, and for higher ideals, which he makes in *Ritter vom Geiste* is the same plea which he constantly made for the same reforms in the German national life. The unity which Gutzkow desires to bring about by the establishment of the order of the "knights of the spirit" is after all only the unity of the German nation, which he so ardently desired and for which he devoted the earnest efforts of forty years.

The scheme which he conjured up to accomplish this end may have been impracticable, it may have had its defects, and probably it could never have been used to bring about the desired results. It is doubtful if Gutzkow ever considered it in the light of a practical reform measure. But after all it is based on sound principles. As the world is coming to discover to an ever increasing extent, progress is the work of ages. Reforms do not come of themselves, nor do they always come in ways expected. The human mind and the human heart must be educated and brought to see the value of human life. Men must be taught the great importance of cooperation. Differences of creed and collisions of conscience must be avoided. The common good must be placed foremost and all must work for that end. This is the great lesson that Gutzkow would have us learn from the novel of the *Ritter vom Geiste*. It is none other than the concept of social service which is coming at the present time to exercise so great a hold upon the public conscience. It is the idea of sacrifice for others. It is the common goal toward which all the forces of righteousness are directing their efforts. The order of the *Ritter vom Geiste* is in the

final analysis the invisible union which exists among men of all faiths, of all countries, and of all times, who are struggling to improve the conditions about them and to render the world a better place to live in.

CHAPTER V.

***

Conclusion.

***

The preceding chapters have traced the effect upon Gutzkow of the various types of socialism with which he came into contact, the attitude that he assumed toward them has been discussed, and his works have been appealed to as the basis from which conclusions have been drawn. It now remains to sum up these results briefly.

First of all the preceding analysis has enabled us to state definitely that Gutzkow was in no ordinarily accepted sense of the term at any period of his life a socialist. He yielded no allegiance to either Utopian or scientific socialism. Toward both of these forms he maintained always a critical attitude. He saw good and evil qualities in both, and accepted the first and rejected the latter. To no form of socialism did he commit himself wholly. At the same time, however, he recognized and acknowledged the importance that these movements possessed. Their significance as surface agitations indicative of an underlying social unrest he realized fully.

Despite the fact that Gutzkow allied himself with no socialistic propaganda, his interest in social and political reforms was intense. Probably there were but few who were more desirous than he for progress in Germany along the lines of social readjustment and national unification. The distress produced by the introduction of the new industrial regime impressed him deeply, and the problem of how best to remedy its

injustices was one with which he was deeply concerned. Similarly the comparatively inferior position which Germany held in the eyes of the world was not at all to his liking, and he looked forward to a united Germany that should be powerful and command respect.

Again Gutzkow was a liberal in his views at a time when liberalism was synonymous with radicalism and innovation. He was one of a number of ardent spirits who desired and fought for democratic ideals in government. He wished to see human rights extended and respected, freedom of the press secured and guaranteed, and liberty of conscience and of belief granted and safeguarded. Mankind he wanted to see animated by the spirit of brotherly love.

Finally Gutzkow might well be characterized as an idealist. He was looking forward to a condition of society that is still far in the future, if, indeed, it is ever to come into existence. And yet in some respects he was sternly practical. To a large extent the distressing conditions in industry against which he protested have been remedied, and with the establishment of the German Empire the national unity of which he dreamed and for which he fought has been largely accomplished. The high ideal of service for others for which he labored is still unattained, but recent years have witnessed a great increase in the spirit of humanitarianism and altruism. We may well consider Gutzkow's life and labors to be of significant value in the inspiration and the uplift which they bring to all who are fighting for progress, truth, and higher ideals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

****

Caselmann, A. *Karl Gutzkows Stellung zu den religiös-ethischen Problemen seiner Zeit.*

Coar, J. F. *Studies in German Literature in the Nineteenth Century.*

Costenoble, H. *Gesammelte Werke von Karl Gutzkow,* (12 vols).

Draeger, O. *Theodor Mundt und seine Beziehungen zum Jungen Deutschland.*

Gostwick and Harrison. *Outlines of German Literature.*

Gottschall, Rudolf von. *Die deutsche Nationalliteratur des neunzehnten Jahrhunaerts.*

Hazen, C. D. *Europe since 1815.*

Houben, H. H. *Gutzkow Funde.*

Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang.

Jung, A. *Briefe über Gutzkows Ritter vom Geiste.*

Kummer, F. *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.*

Lichtenberger, H. *Heinrich Heine als Denker.*

Meyer, R. M. *Die deutsche Litteratur des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.*

Müller, P. *Gutzkows Werke,* (4 vols.).

Ogg, F. A. *Social Progress in Contemporary Europe.*

Proelss, J. *Das Junge Deutschland.*

Ritter vom Geiste, ed. O. Janke.

Robertson, J. G. *A History of German Literature.*

Rosenkranz, K. *Neue Studien,* vol. II.

Strodtmann, A. *Heinrich Heines Leben und Werke,* (2 vols.).

Vogt und Koch. *Deutsche Litteraturgeschichte.*

Wehl, F. *Das Junge Deutschland.*

Weitbrecht, C. *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.*

Ziegler, T. *Die geistigen und socialen Strömungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.*

Elster, E. *Heinrich Heines Sämtliche Werke,* vol. I, INTRODUCTION.

Bliss, W. D. P. *A Handbook of Socialism.*

Dawson, W. H. *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle.*

Gutzkow, K. *Der Zauberer von Rom.*

Marx and Engels. *The Manifesto of the Communist Party.*

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 082198067